

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/763,025	02/16/2001	Tomohiro Ishihara	50395-084	2652	
7590 04/20/2004			EXAM	EXAMINER	
McDermott Will & Emery			HOFFMANN, JOHN M		
600 13th Street NW Washington, DC 20005-3096			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1731		
			DATE MAILED: 04/20/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		/
A Company of the Comp	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/763,025	ISHIHARA ET AL.
Advisory Addon	Examiner	Art Unit
	John Hoffmann	1731
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 08 April 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THE THEORY FILED 08 April 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THEORY FILED 18 TO PLACE THE THEORY FILED 18 TO PLACE T	avoid abandonment of this appli 1) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper reply to a ich places the application in
PERIOD FOR RI	EPLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The data was been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exter 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortene (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three meanned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	visory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the man SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE ate on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 insion and the corresponding amount of the distatutory period for reply originally set in	of the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 136(a) and the appropriate extension fee are fee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF		
$2. \boxtimes$ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered to	pecause:	
(a) 🛛 they raise new issues that would require furth	ner consideration and/or search ((see NOTE below);
(b) 🖾 they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	below);	
(c)	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cance	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.		
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reje	ction(s):	
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	d be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely filed amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: S		sidered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims were appeared to the proposed amendment of the pro		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	· ·	
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected:	,	
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		•/
8.☐ The drawing correction filed on is a)☐ app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.
9.☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	
10.⊠ Other: See Continuation Sheet		

John Hoffmann Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1731 Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303) 009/763,025

Application No.

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The issue is whether the amendment to claim 1 which requires the reducing to be after inserting and before the heating is new matter.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the amendment was not entered. Although the arguments indicate the ultimate paragraph of page 9 has support for the invention, there is no indication that reduction in pressure occurs before the heating. The rest of the arguments are moot because the amendment was not entered.

Continuation of 10. Other: THe indication of allowable subject matter in the final rejection was clearly erroneous because there is no vitrifying claimed. It should have said the prior art does not recognize the thermal shrinkage of claim 1 in conjunction with the further shrinkage of claim 3..